



RECEIVED

MAY 02 2001

[10191/538]

TO 3600 MAIL ROOM

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

#12/Reply
2/ Brief

In re Application of:

Marko MASCHEK et al.

For: PROCESS FOR GENERATING COLLISION
SIGNALS

Filed: November 4, 1997

Serial No.: 08/963,720

:
: Examiner: J. Louis Jacques

: Art Unit: 3661

Assistant Commissioner
for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington,
D.C. 20231, on

Date 4/26/01

Signature

KENYON E. KENYON

REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.193(b)

SIR:

Appellants submit the present Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed February 27, 2001 ("the Answer"). Although not required, two duplicate copies of this Reply Brief are also being submitted herewith as a courtesy to the Patent Office.

For the reasons set forth below and in the Appeal Brief mailed on September 25, 2000, the final rejections of claims 1-3 should be reversed.

REMARKS

From the Answer and previous Office Actions, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is misconstruing the recitation in the claims of the term "transmission function". According to claim 1, the pattern in time of the individual segments of the crash signal is to be simulated for each, by such a transmission function. The transmission function then functionally simulates the pattern of each crash segment. If the individual transmission functions are combined, this yields the overall transmission function which, as a sum of the individual transmission functions, functionally describes the pattern in time of the crash signal. Such transmission functions per se, therefore, reflect the output variable, namely the